

## 1.0 Division of Youth Corrections

### Summary

The Division of Youth Corrections is responsible for all delinquent offenders committed by the State's Juvenile Court. These youth are committed to either long-term secure confinement, short-term observation and assessment, or to alternative community residential placement.

### Financial Summary

	<b>FY 1999 Estimated</b>	<b>FY 2000 Analyst</b>	<b>FY 99/00 Difference</b>
<b>Financing</b>			
General Fund	\$57,549,200	\$59,381,800	\$1,832,600
Federal Funds	754,700	1,428,400	673,700
Dedicated Credits	2,306,300	2,332,000	25,700
Transfers	7,325,000	9,061,500	1,736,500
Restricted Funds	300,000	500,000	200,000
Beginning Nonlapsing	2,800,500		(2,800,500)
Ending Nonlapsing			
Lapsing			
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$71,035,700</b>	<b>\$72,703,700</b>	<b>\$1,668,000</b>
<b>Programs</b>			
Administration/Case Management	\$8,449,700	\$8,449,700	
Community Alternatives	18,979,600	20,479,600	1,500,000
Institutional Operations	25,218,800	24,236,100	(982,700)
Alternatives to Institutionalization	14,332,300	11,674,600	(2,657,700)
Receiving Centers	2,312,000	2,289,500	(22,500)
Out of State Placements	1,482,800	1,482,800	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>70,775,200</b>	<b>68,612,300</b>	<b>(2,162,900)</b>
Youth Parole Authority	260,500	260,500	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$71,035,700</b>	<b>\$68,872,800</b>	<b>(\$2,162,900)</b>
Supplementals			
Building Blocks		3,830,900	3,830,900
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$71,035,700</b>	<b>\$72,703,700</b>	<b>\$1,668,000</b>

## **2.0 Budget Highlights: Division of Youth Corrections**

### **2.1 Internal Service Fund Adjustments**

The Analyst recommends \$170,500 to cover increases in the Internal Service Fund Rates charged to the Division.

**Recommended:** \$170,500 in General Fund

### **2.2 Uinta Youth Facility**

To cover partial year funding for the new 32 bed Uinta Youth facility the Analyst recommends \$1,500,000.

**Recommended:** \$1,500,000 in General Fund

### **2.3 Ogden Youth Facility**

In the 1998 General Session, funds for the initial month's operation of the Ogden Youth Facility were included in the Division appropriation. It now appears that the facility will not come on-line for operations until FY 2001. The Analyst carried the initial funding forward into FY 2000 and then reduced the base accordingly. No new funds for this facility are recommended until FY 2001, at which time full year funding should be considered.

**Recommended:** \$0 in General Fund

### **2.4 Cache Youth Facility**

To fund the initial startup of the 32 bed Ogden Secure Youth Facility the Analyst recommends \$1,500,000.

**Recommended:** \$1,500,000 in General Fund

### **2.6 Juvenile Justice Block Grant**

To upgrade the accountability of youthful offenders the Federal Block Grant for Juvenile Justice includes the following items which the Analyst recommends for one time Federal Funding

**Recommended:**

Re-engineering (Information Systems)	\$360,400 in one-time Federal Funds
Grant Monitoring	25,000 in one-time Federal Funds
Out-of-State Placements	75,000 in one-time Federal Funds
Electronic Monitoring/Home Detention	200,000 in one-time Federal Funds

**Total budget  
enhancements and one-  
time expenditures**

<b>Financing</b>	<b>FY 2000</b>
General Fund	\$3,170,500
Federal Funds	660,400
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>\$3,830,900</u></b>
<b>Programs</b>	
ISF Rate Adjustments	\$170,500
Uinta	1,500,000
Ogden	
Cache	1,500,000
Information System	360,400
Grant Monitoring	25,000
Out of State Placements	75,000
Electronic Monitoring	200,000
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>\$3,830,900</u></b>

### 3.0 Programs

#### **Sentencing Commission Priorities for Youth Corrections**

The Utah Sentencing Commission, under Section 63-25a-301 thru 306 UCA, has independently reviewed the various juvenile offender sanctions available in Utah. From their review they have made recommendations for the priority of intermediate sanctions that should be provided. The Youth Corrections Division is the agency which is responsible for delivering those sanctions (in concert with and sometimes in conjunction with the Juvenile Court). Therefore those recommendations should be available to the subcommittee as it reviews the allocation of FY 2000 resources for sanctioning young offenders.

#### **Sentencing Commission Priorities**

- 1a. Residential High-risk Observation and Assessment  
For seriously mentally ill and drug abusing youth  
Term would be 120 days of out-of-home residency  
Initial target - 16 male slots for ages 12 -16 years
- 1b. Non-residential substance abuse programs
2. Work camps
3. Enhanced traditional services  
(Including electronic monitoring, home detention, and day reporting)

#### **Performance Audit**

The Legislative Auditor General's Report 99-01, *A performance Audit of Utah's Juvenile Justice System*, reviews the programs of both the Division of Youth Corrections and the Juvenile Court. The report details analysis of early intervention strategies, needs for a more comprehensive assessment procedure, a more effective system of graduated sanctions and some strongly focused observations as to the relationships between the Courts and the Division.

This report, in it's entirety, will be released prior to the subcommittee hearings on Juvenile Court or Youth Corrections.

#### **Recommendation**

The Analyst recommends that the subcommittee should hear a report from the audit team prior to any decision making on the Juvenile Court or Division of Youth Corrections budgets.

#### **Juvenile Crime**

In 1997, the last complete year of data, there were 36,100 juvenile arrests. Of these the three largest categories in priority order were:

1. Larceny (theft)
2. Liquor law violations
3. Vandalism

These three categories represented 14,065 or 39 percent of all juvenile arrests. These are the crimes that intuitively one expects from the youngest population in the country.

These numbers are consistent with the idea that almost half of the youth that come in contact with the juvenile court do so just once and do not repeat offend.

At the same time there are juveniles committing crimes of violence. As in other jurisdictions throughout the country a small percentage of the youth are committing a major percentage of the crimes, and more importantly, an overwhelming majority of the felonies. These youth are the engines driving the press and the public to demand more and better programs. And it is these youth that we must identify and deal with in the Juvenile Courts and the Division of Youth Corrections.

In-depth studies in other jurisdictions of the country indicate that the most serious offender portion of the youth population is approximately 7 percent.

**Serious Youth  
Offenders**

Serious youth Offenders are those who, as a matter of public policy, are removed from the juvenile system and are treated as adults. As of August 1998, 77 youth have been so classified. Of these 53 were transferred to adult court. Of those transferred 13 were sent to adult prison.

**Map Page**

**3.1 Administration** The Administration of the Division of Youth Corrections includes both the State office and staff and the Regional managers, staffs and case managers.

**Recommendation** The Analyst recommends a continuation budget for this program.

**Financial Summary**

	<b>FY 1998</b>	<b>FY 1999</b>	<b>FY 2000</b>	<b>FY 99/00</b>
<b>Financing</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Analyst</b>	<b>Difference</b>
General Fund	\$6,147,700	\$6,636,200	\$6,504,200	(\$132,000)
Federal Funds	16,500	14,700	14,000	(700)
Dedicated Credits		342,500	345,400	2,900
Transfers	1,187,300	1,456,300	1,586,100	129,800
Beginning Nonlapsing	385,900			
Ending Nonlapsing	(237,000)			
Lapsing				
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$7,500,400</b>	<b>\$8,449,700</b>	<b>\$8,449,700</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**State Office** The Division Director and his staff supervise all aspects of Youth Corrections operations, provide training, set standards, certify programs, and conduct research. The Board of Youth Corrections meets regularly throughout the State and provides oversight for the Division of Youth Corrections System.

**Families, Agencies, Communities Together (FACT)**  
**(FACT = Coordinated Services for At Risk Children)**

**Summary: The agency cooperative began in 1989** In 1989, according to the Coordinated Services for At Risk Children and Youth Act (U.C.A. Title 63, Chapter 75), a council for at risk children was formed to unite the Department of Human Services, the State Office of Education, and the Department of Health, to develop and implement comprehensive school-based systems of services for each at risk student in grades kindergarten through third and the student's family in order to help prevent academic failure and social misbehavior. Initially, funding from all three agencies involved were used to address the needs of at risk students according to the council which was set up to administer these funds.

**Program expanded significantly in FY 1994** The 1993 Legislature expanded the FACT program for FY 1994 with the passage of Coordinated Services for Children At Risk Amendments.

**Compliance with Legislative Intent** From the Analysts perspective this report also facilitates coordination among the respective Appropriations Subcommittees for Public Education, Workforce Services, Health and Human Services, and Criminal Justice. The Legislative Fiscal Analysts, and the four departments met during the interim and discussed the FACT budget and its funding. Their response is included in the budget materials provided to all four Appropriations Subcommittees.

**The FACT System is open ended**

- ▶ The implications of a “Children’s Budget” are potentially great. Preliminary calculations of the State Budget for all current expenditures for Children’s Services could be well over \$700,000,000 depending on what areas are categorized. If the proposed service delivery methodology appears attractive to the Legislature it is suggested that a number of public policy issues be addressed.
- ▶ The current proposal does not establish a governmental role of involvement but leaves the system open ended. Are local entities going to define the government role as opposed to elected officials and representatives?
- ▶ FACT published philosophy calls for early intervention at the first sign of problems. Such philosophy clearly broadens services beyond what the Legislature has defined as appropriate. A tendency to spend according to need without regard to established public policy (standards) is commendable in the social context but creates no accountability for the public trust funds.
- ▶ DYC currently contributes \$49,500 to FACT programs

**Action of the 1997 General Session**

The Legislature in the 1996 General Session established a requirement for a joint meeting of the Appropriations Subcommittees for Health and Human Services, Public Education, and Executive Offices, Criminal Justice and the Legislature. That joint meeting has been tentatively set for February 5, 1999. **Six representatives of this subcommittee (3 Senate and 3 House) should attend the 5 February meeting** and report back any recommendations which might effect the budgets under review.

**Training**

Recent legal actions have highlighted the need for additional training within the division. Such training has been enhanced in FY 1996 and FY 1997 but the division still represents a risk for the state due to significant growth over a relative short period causing a need for training a great number of new hires and place them in critical positions earlier in their careers than in the past. Last year the Analyst recommended an addition of \$18,000 in FY 1999 to upgrade the training of existing staff. The subcommittee may wish a report from the division of the status of staff training.

**Gangs and gang related violence are growing**

Utah has had gangs since the early 1970s, but the perceived growth of gangs and gang related violence has made gangs and gang activity a major public policy issue. Gangs in Utah are generally turf oriented. The Salt Lake Gang Projects reports that there are 180 gangs operating in the metropolitan area with over 1,400 identified members. Approximately **one-third of the membership are juveniles.**

**Utah is successful in turning around juvenile offenders**

National statistics on youth recidivism show 18 year-olds have a 90 percent recidivism rate. Utah, in contrast, has remarkable results on it’s youth in trouble, although almost every youth that gets to the Division of Youth Corrections is already a chronic or repeat offender.



**National Recognition**

Utah's Division of Youth Corrections has been described by national juvenile justice experts as one of the leaders in the national movement to deinstitutionalize juvenile offenders, and has been cited as a model system for others to follow. National leaders in juvenile justice and youth corrections continue to use Utah's system as a model for their own development.

**Internal Service Fund  
Adjustments**

The Analyst recommends \$170,500 to cover increases in the Internal Service Fund Rates charged to the Division.

**Recommended:**           \$170,500 in General Fund

## **Regional Offices/Case Management**

### **Summary**

The Division has chosen to provide every youth, in the Division of Youth Corrections custody, an assigned case manager. These workers have 24 hour on-call responsibility for Division of Youth Corrections youth and provide supervision and coordination of treatment plans. Case Managers also provide direct counseling services to youth and families and serve as liaison to the Juvenile Court.

On a typical day in 1998, 1,176 youth were served  
There are 54 Case Managers  
Average case load is 21

### **Overlap with Juvenile Court**

Functions of the case managers are similar to the tracking done by the probation officers of the Juvenile Court. Whereas youth move back and forth between the Juvenile Court and Youth Corrections two sets of tracking records are being kept that overlap and duplicate each other. The same is true of program offerings. Both agencies are now funded to provide programming for the same target population.

### **Juvenile Justice Block Grant**

To upgrade the accountability of youthful offenders the Federal Block Grant for Juvenile Justice includes the following items which the Analyst recommends for one time Federal Funding

#### **Recommendation:**

Re-engineering (Information Systems)	\$360,400 in one time Federal Funds
Grant Monitoring	25,000 in one time Federal Funds
Out of State Placements	75,000 in one time Federal Funds*
Electronic Monitoring/Home Detention	200,000 in one time Federal Funds

\*Out of State Placements is a separate program in the Analyst's presentation, but, the one time Federal Block Grant item is shown here so as to keep the full breadth of the Block Grant in one place in the presentation.

### 3.2 Community Alternatives

**Recommendation** The Analyst recognizes the increased pressure on all of the programs of the Division and recommends a continuation budget for this program. A significant increase in Title XIX Federal Funds (Medicaid) is reflected in the transfers funding of this budget.

#### Financial Summary

	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 99/00
<b>Financing</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Analyst</b>	<b>Difference</b>
General Fund	\$9,613,300	\$11,331,600	\$11,110,100	(\$221,500)
Federal Funds	666,700	700,000	714,000	14,000
Dedicated Credits	2,206,600	1,914,000	1,935,100	21,100
Transfers	3,437,800	4,497,000	6,220,400	1,723,400
Restricted Funds	300,000	300,000	500,000	200,000
Beginning Nonlapsing		237,000		(237,000)
Ending Nonlapsing				
Lapsing				
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$16,224,400</b>	<b>\$18,979,600</b>	<b>\$20,479,600</b>	<b>\$1,500,000</b>

**Summary** Community-based residential and nonresidential programs and services include: group homes, proctor advocates, foster care, alternative education, clinical treatment, tracking, vocational training and career development.

**Legislative Intent** The Legislature indicated that community based alternatives are the preferred method of dealing with youthful offenders and approved the following language which was included in the Appropriations Act of the 1989 General Session:

*It is the intent of the Legislature that the Division of Youth Corrections continue and wherever possible increase the utilization of community based alternatives to secure incarceration of youth in the custody of the Division.*

*“Utah’s approach to rehabilitation using the Community Based Alternative System has been demonstrated, through independent research, to provide effective treatment to youth as well as cost benefits and protection to the citizens of the State through reduced recidivism and reduction of severity of crimes for those youth who do recidivate.”*

*“The Legislature recognizes the national prominence of the Division’s approach and expressly directs the Division to actively pursue additional Community Alternatives and strengthen those which are currently in effect.”*

The Division attempted to give program priority two alternatives in spite of pressures to shift to more incarceration of youth.

**Recommendation**                      The Analyst recommends that the above intent language be continued for the FY 2000 Appropriation Act.

**Delinquency levels of  
Community  
Alternative program  
youth**                      The average youth committed to community alternatives has had 13 felony and misdemeanor convictions. Approximately 30 percent have had one or more life endangering felonies. In 1998 73.2 percent of the youth served were between 10 and 14.

**Performance Measures**

- ▶ There are approximately 64 providers.
- ▶ In 1998 there were 1,373 youth admitted.
- ▶ Approximately 75 percent of delinquents are between 15 and 17 years old. (9.6 percent are girls)
- ▶ services provided fall into the following categories:

**Residential**

Proctor  
Group home  
Intensive group home  
Sex offender treatment

**Non-residential**

Tracking services 12.76/hour  
Individual and family counseling  
Group therapy  
Psychological evaluation  
Psychiatric evaluation

Costs per day range from \$13 (tracking) to \$131 (most intensive residential treatment).

### 3.3 Alternatives to Secure Care

The State has been very effective at using alternatives to placing youth in institutional settings.

**Recommendation**

The Analyst recommends a continuing budget for this program. The apparent reduction in program is due to the \$2.5 million carryover in FY 1999 from the previous fiscal year.

**Financial Summary**

	<b>FY 1998</b>	<b>FY 1999</b>	<b>FY 2000</b>	<b>FY 99/00</b>
<b>Financing</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Analyst</b>	<b>Difference</b>
General Fund	\$11,646,000	\$11,540,900	\$11,540,900	
Dedicated Credits	(500)			
Transfers	499,600	227,900	133,700	(\$94,200)
Beginning Nonlapsing		2,563,500		(2,563,500)
Ending Nonlapsing	(2,563,500)			
Lapsing				
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$9,581,600</b>	<b>\$14,332,300</b>	<b>\$11,674,600</b>	<b>(\$2,657,700)</b>

**Performance Measures**

The cost of construction of secure beds is estimated to be \$75,000 per bed and the daily cost of care is now over \$127.37 per youth. In addition, there has been a change in the profile of youth referred to Youth Corrections for placement. Youth are becoming increasingly involved in gang activity and substance abuse.

### 3.31a State Supervision

**Recommendation** A component of the new Juvenile Sentencing Matrix is the development of a series of programs called State Supervision in both the Courts and Youth Corrections. The subcommittee should have the Division report on this category of youth and the programs and costs associated with “supervision” as a category of assignment.

### 3.31b Work Camps

**Genesis** House Bill 3, 1993 Second Special Session authorized the Division to set up Work Camps. House Bill 13, Supplemental Appropriations for Juvenile Reform (2<sup>nd</sup> Special Session, 1993) appropriated \$1,729,600 to establish such a program at the Lone Peak Facility of the Utah State Prison. The facility chosen was one converted from the Lone Peak Facility at Draper (formerly a part of the state prison complex). The Department of Corrections vacated the facility as of November 1993. This facility houses 72 youths in a variety of program settings.

- ▶ Cost per bed \$92.78 per day
- ▶ Total admissions in 1998 - 304

**Camp Strawberry** The Camp Strawberry season ended in August 1998. During this time, 11 female youth, aging from 14 to 17 years old were admitted to the program. Youth were referred to Camp Strawberry by the Division of Youth Corrections and the Fourth District Juvenile Court Probation Department. Youth placed in Camp Strawberry had to meet one of three conditions: 1) a youth who was on probation and had at least three weeks of work hours or restitution to complete, 2) a youth on probation with at least three weeks of post adjudicated work hours or restitution who was being placed in detention, or 3) a youth with a least three weeks of work hours or restitution who was in the custody of the Division of Youth Corrections.

Youth placed at Camp Strawberry, worked with the US Forest Service in the Uinta National Forest removing and building fences, constructing trails, cleaning camp grounds, and rehabilitating streams. During the three months of operation the 24 youth were able to give back to the community approximately 2,700 hours of restitution and community service.

**Elbow Ranch** In early 1998, Heritage Youth Services is looking forward to establishing a year-round work program in central Utah called the Elbow Ranch which is an alternative to detention and function to meet the needs of youth similar to those who benefitted from Camp Strawberry.

### **3.3c Observation and Assessment**

<b>Summary</b>	<p>The Division of Youth Corrections currently operates three regional Observation and Assessment Centers, located in Salt Lake City, Ogden and Springville. The new Farmington and Provo facilities also include O&amp;A beds. These programs provide short-term (90 day or less) assessment and treatment planning in a residential setting. Observation and assessment youth receive complete psychological, educational and physical assessments to help recommend appropriate future placement to Juvenile Court Judges. Approximately 34 percent of those admitted have committed a life-endangering felony.</p>
<b>Delinquency History</b>	<p>Youth admitted in FY 1996 had an average of 9.36 felony and misdemeanor convictions and 285 had committed a life endangering felony offense.</p>
<b>Performance Data</b>	<p>Cost per youth per day for FY 1998 was 151.78. In 1998 625 youth were served by this program.</p> <p>The Analyst notes that in interviews with juvenile judges, the O&amp;A program is the one most mentioned as a meaningful input to judicial decisions. A specialized O &amp; A facility for seriously mentally ill or drug using youth is the first priority recommendation by the Sentencing Commission for FY 2000.</p>
<b>Sexual offender treatment</b>	<p>The Analyst is convinced that the early intervention in juvenile sex offenders careers is a cost effective public policy. Early intervention with treatment for youthful sex offenders can save lives and reduce long term costs to the State.</p>

### 3.3d Alternative to Detention

#### Summary

The Division has developed a package of alternatives to detention. These Alternatives use General funds and matching pass through funds from Federal grants in the Criminal Justice Commission. Some of the elements of this effort are:

- ▶ Day/night Reporting Centers
- ▶ Home Detention
- ▶ Detention Diversion
- ▶ Electronic Monitoring

The Analyst notes that some of the one time Federal Funds available from the “Block Grant” are targeted for electronic monitoring and home detention.

#### Home Detention

“Home Detention” is a pre-dispositional alternative to “Secure Detention” that involves the short-term control and supervision of juveniles in their own homes or those of surrogates. Youth, who otherwise would be held in secure detention, are supervised in the community pending disposition of their charges by the Juvenile Court. They receive daily supervision by counselors who make unannounced contacts and who provide support not only to the youth but also to parents, school personnel, and probation officers or caseworkers.

Home detention is operated from eight detention centers statewide. The increasing use of Home Detention has a beneficial impact on the demand for the more expensive secure detention facilities built and operated entirely at State expense.

#### Performance

- |                           |                 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|
| ▶ Home Detention programs | 7               |
| ▶ cost per youth          | \$12.72 per day |
| ▶ admissions              | 1,787           |
| ▶ different youth served  | 1,483           |



**3.4 Institutional Care**

Institutional care represents the variety of facilities and programs that include some level of institutional or restricted living. These include:

- ▶ Youth Detention
- ▶ Secure Facilities
- ▶ Multi-use Facilities

**Recommendation**

The Analyst recommends a continuation budget.

**Financial Summary**

	<b>FY 1998</b>	<b>FY 1999</b>	<b>FY 2000</b>	<b>FY 99/00</b>
<b>Financing</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Analyst</b>	<b>Difference</b>
General Fund	\$23,875,200	\$24,775,500	\$23,791,100	(\$984,400)
Federal Funds	125,500	40,000	40,000	
Dedicated Credits	42,700	49,800	51,500	1,700
Transfers	375,800	353,500	353,500	
Beginning Nonlapsing	14,100			
Ending Nonlapsing				
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$24,433,300</b>	<b>\$25,218,800</b>	<b>\$24,236,100</b>	<b>(\$982,700)</b>

### 3.4a Detention

#### Summary

In 1989, legislative changes broadened the Division of Youth Corrections responsibilities to include the administration and operation of all Juvenile Detention centers (as well as retaining the services to post-adjudicated youth). These facilities provide short-term detention for pre-adjudicated youth. Secure Detention is the classical secure facility for youths which the public usually equates to the adult jail.

#### Performance

	Capacity	Average Nightly Bed Count	Percent Nights Over Capacity
Cache	8	10	72.9%
Farmington Bay	24	20.1	16.4%
Weber Valley	34	30.4	20.3%
Salt Lake	160	138.4	10.1%
Canyonlands	4	5.7	70.4%
Southwest	10	8.6	23.3%
St. George	10	11.7	65.5%
Castle Country	6	9.4	89.6%
Central Utah	4	8.9	89.9%
Slate Canyon Youth	38	18.9	21.1%
Uintah	4	9	94.2%
Provo	24	20.2	46.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>291.9</b>	

Programs/facilities	6
Cost	127.37 per night (does not include multiuse detention)
Admissions	10,793

Admitted youth averaged 15.8 years old

Average length of stay is 98.1 days

Note: Four Wasatch counties accounted for 70% of all admissions and represent 75 percent of the 10 to 17 year olds in the state.

#### Salt Lake Facility

The new Youth detention facility in Salt Lake City which is operated by a private contractor, opened on February 8, 1997. **This facility has 160 beds and is the largest facility in the system.**

The old Salt Lake Detention facility was converted to secure status and is known as the Wasatch secure facility.

### 3.4b Secure Facilities

#### Summary

Division of Youth Corrections currently operates facilities including: the 30 bed facility in Ogden (Mill Creek), the 40 bed facility in Salt Lake (Decker Lake), the 10 bed secure facility in Cedar City and the multiuse facility at Farmington (18 secure beds). To accommodate growing demand for more beds the Division added, by double bunking, to the secure facilities. The additions amount to;

- ▶ 16 beds at Decker Lake
- ▶ 12 beds at Millcreek
- ▶ 4 beds at Cedar City

None of the support facilities were enlarged or significantly modified to accommodate the extra population being absorbed by these additions.

- ▶ Newly constructed and operating secure facilities include:

Wasatch (Salt Lake)	56 beds
Slate Canyon (Provo)	32 beds

Underconstruction

Ogden	72 beds
(Addition to Millcreek)	

These programs are designed to provide security and long-term treatment for those youths that the Juvenile Court believes cannot be safely maintained in the community. These facilities offer high security and a diversity of therapeutic and educational programming designed to impact criminal thinking and antisocial behavior.

#### Delinquency

Youth in the secure facilities of the State tend to be those with the most advanced criminal histories.

The average youth admitted has 5.3 felony and 15.1 misdemeanor convictions. In 1996, 71 percent of youth admitted had committed one or more life endangering felonies.

- ▶ Average age 16.9 years old
- ▶ Only 4.4 percent female

Average cost/day	\$148.93 for the six programs currently operating.
Total bed capacity	214
Median length of stay was	12.6 months
Average length of stay was	4.1 months longer than the guidelines

#### Utah County

The State has a multiple use 60 bed facility in Utah County opened in FY 1997 which replaces the old detention center. This facility is known as the Slate Canyon Youth Facility.

**Ogden Youth Facility**

In the 1998 General Session funds for the initial months operation of the Ogden Youth Facility were included in the Division appropriation. It now appears that the facility will not come on-line for operations until FY 2001. The Analyst has carried the initial funding forward into FY 2000 and then reduced the base accordingly. No new funds for this facility are recommended until FY 2001, at which time full year funding should be considered.

**Recommended:** \$0 in General Fund

### 3.4c Multi-use Facilities

The rural areas of the State are served by multi-use facilities and combine short-term detention with shelter care. Currently, three such facilities are in operation (Richfield, Vernal, and Blanding). The new Farmington Facility also has a mixture of beds.

Larger multi-use facilities are being developed in the metropolitan areas of the State to achieve economies of scale in construction and operations.

#### Performance

▸ Programs	5
▸ Cost per bed per day	\$133
▸ Detention Capacity	30
▸ Shelter Capacity	32
▸ Youth served in detention	1,151

#### Uinta Youth Facility

To cover partial year funding for the new 32 bed Uinta Youth facility the Analyst recommends \$1,500,000.

**Recommended:** \$1,500,000 in General Fund

#### Cache Youth Facility

To fund the initial startup of the 32 bed Cache Secure Youth Facility the Analyst recommends \$1,500,000.

**Recommended:** \$1,500,000 in General Fund

### 3.5 Receiving Centers

**Recommendation**            The Analyst recommends a continuation budget for these centers.

**Financial Summary**

	<b>FY 1998</b>	<b>FY 1999</b>	<b>FY 2000</b>	<b>FY 99/00</b>
<b>Financing</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Analyst</b>	<b>Difference</b>
General Fund	\$1,269,600	\$1,521,700	\$1,521,700	
Transfers	117,800	790,300	767,800	(\$22,500)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,387,400</b>	<b>\$2,312,000</b>	<b>\$2,289,500</b>	<b>(\$22,500)</b>

**Analyst's note**            The concept of the receiving center is to reduce the hours law enforcement use in finding placements for youth picked up. The existing centers have broad support from local law enforcement officials.

The 11 centers operating across the state served 8,350 youth in 1998.

Typical length of stay was 2 hours.

### 3.6 Youth Parole Authority

The Youth Parole Authority was carried under the Division Administration Budget. It is now being presented as a separate budget entity. The Analyst is recommending a continuation budget for this program.

**Recommendation**

The Analyst recommends a continuation budget for this program.

**Financial Summary**

	<b>FY 1998</b>	<b>FY 1999</b>	<b>FY 2000</b>	<b>FY 99/00</b>
<b>Financing</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Analyst</b>	<b>Difference</b>
General Fund	\$237,600	\$260,500	\$260,500	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$237,600</b>	<b>\$260,500</b>	<b>\$260,500</b>	

**Summary**

Youth committed to the secure facilities of the Division of Youth Correction come under the jurisdiction of the Youth Parole Authority. The Parole Authority is a citizen board and acts independently of the Division administration.

The board held 789 hearings in FY 1998, a 21 percent increase over the previous year.

The Analyst recommends making the Youth Parole authority a separate line item from that of Youth Corrections.

### 3.7 Out of State Placements

To better highlight the funds being used for out-of-state placements of youth by the Division, these funds are shown as a separate program.

#### Recommendation

The Analyst recommends a continuation budget for this program.

#### Financial Summary

	<b>FY 1998</b>	<b>FY 1999</b>	<b>FY 2000</b>	<b>FY 99/00</b>
<b>Financing</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Analyst</b>	<b>Difference</b>
General Fund	\$0	\$1,482,800	\$1,482,800	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,482,800</b>	<b>\$1,482,800</b>	



## 4.0 Tables

	<b>FY 1997</b>	<b>FY 1998</b>	<b>FY 1999</b>	<b>FY 2000</b>
<b>Financing</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Analyst</b>
General Fund	\$41,418,700	\$52,789,400	\$57,549,200	\$59,381,800
Federal Funds	928,300	808,700	754,700	1,428,400
Dedicated Credits	511,200	2,248,800	2,306,300	2,332,000
Transfers	5,330,200	5,618,300	7,325,000	9,061,500
Restricted Funds	450,000	300,000	300,000	500,000
Beginning Nonlapsing	1,900,900	400,000	2,800,500	
Ending Nonlapsing	(400,000)	(2,800,500)		
Lapsing	(2,300)			
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$50,137,000</b>	<b>\$59,364,700</b>	<b>\$71,035,700</b>	<b>\$72,703,700</b>

	<b>FY 1997</b>	<b>FY 1998</b>	<b>FY 1999</b>	<b>FY 2000</b>
<b>Programs</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Analyst</b>
Administration/Case Management	\$6,148,300	\$7,500,400	\$8,449,700	\$8,449,700
Community Alternatives	15,729,000	16,224,400	18,979,600	20,479,600
Institutional Operations	19,248,900	24,433,300	25,218,800	24,236,100
Alternatives to Institutionalization	7,584,500	9,581,600	14,332,300	11,674,600
Receiving Centers	1,214,400	1,387,400	2,312,000	2,289,500
Out of State Placements			1,482,800	1,482,800
Youth Parole Authority	211,900	237,600	260,500	260,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$50,137,000</b>	<b>\$59,364,700</b>	<b>\$71,035,700</b>	<b>\$68,872,800</b>

<b>FTE</b>	<b>FY 1997</b>	<b>FY 1998</b>	<b>FY 1999</b>	<b>FY 2000</b>
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Analyst</b>
Administration	120.50	120.50	136.00	136.00
Community Alternatives				
Institutional Operations	365.60	365.60	383.40	451.40
Alternatives to Institutions	199.75	199.75	199.00	200.00
Receiving Centers	16.10	16.10	41.00	41.00
Youth Parole Authority	7.00	7.00	10.50	10.50
	<b>708.95</b>	<b>708.95</b>	<b>769.90</b>	<b>838.90</b>

**4.1 Federal Funds**

<b>Program</b>	<b>FY 1997 Actual</b>	<b>FY 1998 Actual</b>	<b>FY 1999 Estimated</b>	<b>FY 2000 Analyst</b>
Department of Justice Misc.	\$4,000	\$125,500	\$40,000	\$40,000
Juvenile Justice	9,500			660,400
Title IVa AFDC Assistance	20,000			
Title XX, Soc. Services Block Grant	17,000	16,500	14,700	14,000
Title IVa AFDC FC	877,600	666,800	700,000	714,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$928,100</b>	<b>\$808,800</b>	<b>\$754,700</b>	<b>\$1,428,400</b>

Note: Title XIX match rate for FY 2000 is 71.6075 Federal

